THE LAW OFFICE OF CATHERINE PARK

2300 M Street, NW Suite 800 Washington, D.C. 20037

PHONE: (202) 973-6479 Fax: (866) 747-7566

E-Mail: Catherine Park@cparklaw.com Website: www.cparklaw.com

MAXED FILE COPY ORIGINAL

December 11, 2007

Marlene H. Dortch Secretary Federal Communications Commission 236 Massachusetts Avenue, NE Suite 110 Washington, D.C. 20002

FILED/ACCEPTED
DEC 1 1 2007

Federal Communications Commission Office of the Secretary

RE: Opposition to Motion for Ruling on Objections by Avatar Enterprises, Inc.; EB Docket No. 07-197

Dear Madame Secretary:

Enclosed for filing on behalf of parties Kurtis J. Kintzel, Keanan Kintzel, and all other Entities by which they do business before the Federal Communications Commission, is the original and 6 copies of the Opposition to the Motion for Ruling on Objections by Avatar Enterprises, Inc., in the above-referenced matter.

Sincerely,

Catherine Park, Esq.

Enclosures: Original + 6 Copies

atheire Park, Esq.

No. of Copies rec'd CHC

Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	
Kurtis J. Kintzel, Keanan Kintzel, and all Entities by which they do business before the Federal Communications Commission	EB Docket No. 07-197
Resellers of Telecommunications Services	FILED/ACCEPTED
To: Presiding Officer (Richard L. Sippel,	DEC 1 1 2007
Chief ALJ)	Federal Communications Commission Office of the Secretary

OPPOSITION TO ENFORCEMENT BUREAU'S MOTION FOR RULING ON OBJECTIONS BY KURTIS J. AND KEANAN KINTZEL TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION OF FACTS AND GENUINENESS OF DOCUMENTS

Kurtis J. and Keanan Kintzel, by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby submit this Opposition to the Enforcement Bureau's Motion for Ruling on Objections, Etc. The parties submit that they have answered the Bureau's Requests for Admission as directed by 47 C.F.R. § £246(b), which requires the party to answer or to object to the requests, and if an objection is interposed, to state the basis for its objection. The parties' objection is based on the law of finited liability. See, e.g., Answers, Kurtis J. Kintzel. A shareholder generally cannot be held liable for corporate obligations without piercing the corporate veil. See, e.g., Vuitch v. Furr, 482 A.2d 811, 815 (D.C. 1984). Piercing the corporate veil is an extraordinary remedy, used only in exceptional cases to remedy fraud or injustice. See, e.g., Dole Food Co. v. Patrickson, 538 U.S. 468, 475 (2003); see, e.g., Labadie Coal Co. v. Black, 672 F.2d 92, 97-99 (D.C. Cir. 1982). The Order to Show Cause does not allege fraud or injustice, or any other justification for veil-

piercing under existing law. See Order. For that reason, Kurtis J. and Keanan Kintzel are not "proper subjects of requests for admission," to use the Bureau's parlance from the Motion for Ruling on Objections. Mot., p. 2.

In view of the foregoing, Kurtis J. and Keanan Kintzel submit that they have answered the Bureau's Requests for Admission as directed by 47 C.F.R. § 1.246(b), and that the Bureau's Motion for Ruling on Objections should be denied.

Respectfully Submitted,

Catherine Park (DC Bar # 492812)

The Law Office of Catherine Park 2300 M Street, NW, Suite 800

Washington, D.C. 20037

Phone: (202) 973-6479 Fax: (866) 747-7566

Email: contact@cparklaw.com

Certificate of Service

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was sent for filing on this 11th day of December 2007, by hand delivery, to the following:

Marlene H. Dortch Secretary Federal Communications Commission 236 Massachusetts Avenue, NE Suite 110 Washington, D.C. 20002

And served by U.S. Mail, First Class, on the following:

Richard L. Sippel, Chief Administrative Law Judge Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW, Room 1-C861 Washington, D.C. 20554

Hillary DeNigro, Chief Michele Levy Berlove, Attorney Investigations & Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW, Room 4-C330 Washington, D.C. 20554

Catherine Park